

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

WILLIAM D. WEBSTER,

Plaintiff,

v.

KITSAP COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE, et
al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C09-5036 FDB

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
FILE 2ND AMENDED COMPLAINT

This matter comes before the Court on motion of Plaintiff to file a 2nd Amended Complaint. Although Plaintiff has not provided this Court, nor the Defendants, with a copy of the proposed amendment, his motion apparently seeks to name “Kitsap County” as a Defendant.

Although Defendants have not been served with a copy of the proposed 2nd Amended Complaint, Defendants do not oppose the naming of Kitsap County as a proper defendant. Defendants do oppose any additional amendments to the complaint that have not been set forth in the motion.

The Court finds it appropriate to permit amendment of the complaint for the sole purpose of

1 naming Kitsap County as a party defendant.¹


2 ACCORDINGLY:

3 IT IS ORDERED:

4 Plaintiff's Motion to File 2nd Amended Complaint [Dkt. # 22] is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff shall
5 serve and file the 2nd Amended Complaint naming Kitsap County as a defendant no later
6 than October 9, 2009

7 DATED this 2nd day of October, 2009.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26



FRANKLIN D. BURGESS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1.Plaintiff has also filed a Motion for Sanctions regarding the scheduling of a joint status conference [Dkt. #23]. Plaintiff's motion is without merit. Status conferences are generally conducted telephonically and in this matter is appropriate. The motion for sanctions is **DENIED**.